

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 3 November 2006. Responsive to that Office Action, Claim 33 is now additionally canceled, and Claims 29-31 are amended for further prosecution with the other pending Claim. Such cancellation and amendment of Claims are made in the interest of expediting prosecution of this case, in light of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Such cancellation and amendment of Claims are made, moreover, without addressing the merits of the rejections set forth in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The amendments also include correction of a readily-apparent typographic informality noted in Claim 31.

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted the clarification of certain terminology discussed with the Applicant's representative to avoid confusion as to the relative identification of frames. This clarification in terminology is now reflected in the amendments incorporated into the Claims hereby.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lee reference in view of the Zetts reference. As for Claim 33, the Examiner merely objected to the Claim for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that the Claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the

base and any intervening claims, and upon clarifying the terminology as noted above.

Accordingly, the subject matter of Claim 33 is now incorporated into Claim 31, with Claim 33 being correspondingly canceled. Each occurrence of the terms "first frame" and "second frame" has been corrected respectively to "current frame" and "frame." Thus, it is believed that Claims 29 as well as Claims 31-32 which depend therefrom are now in allowable form.

Again, such cancellation and amendment of Claims are made in the interests of expediting prosecution in this case, and without addressing the merits of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections set forth in the Office Action.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

MR1035-1502/DIV3  
Serial Number: 11/086,464  
Reply to Office Action dated 3 November 2006

If there are any further charges associated with this filing, the Honorable Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account #18-2011 for such charges.

Respectfully submitted,  
FOR: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee  
Registration No. 40,262

Dated: 3/1/2007

Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
Tel: 410-465-6678  
Customer No. 04586